

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the pending Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to further clarify the intended subject matter of the invention and to overcome the § 112 rejection. The limitations of claim 4 have been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 4 has been cancelled, without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

II. The Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner alleges that the limitation “the electric double layer of the interface” in line 2 of claim 8 does not have sufficient antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended the above cited claim to recite “[the]] an electric double layer of the interface”. Accordingly, Applicants request that the § 112 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

III. The Rejection Of Claims 1-3 And 5-14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claims 1-3, 5-8 and 12-14 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hollis (USP No. 5,846,708) in view of Vogel (USP No. 6,758,961); claims 1-3 and 5-8 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Schoeniger (US 2003/0211637) in view of Vogel; claims 9-11 have been rejected as being unpatentable over either Hollis or Schoeniger in view of Vogel and further in view of Nisch (USP No. 6,315,940); and claims 12-14 have been

rejected as being unpatentable over Schoeniger in view of Vogel and further in view of Wolf (USP No. 6,376,233).

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter recited in claim 4. In response to the Office Action, Applicants have incorporated the limitations of claim 4 into claim 1 and cancelled claim 4, without prejudice. As such, claim 1 now constitutes allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejections of claim 1 be withdrawn.

IV. All Dependent Claims Are Allowable Because The Independent Claim From Which They Depend Is Allowable

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claim 1 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejections of claims 2-3 and 5-14 be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/694,396

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/NDM:kap
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 12, 2007